



**Solicitation Information  
January 17, 2014**

**Addendum #2**

**RFP # 7548375**

**TITLE: RFP – ENTERPRISE INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDER & CORE WAN SERVICES**

**Submission Deadline: February 4, 2014 @ 11:30 AM (Eastern Time)**

**PLEASE NOTE: -- A vendor submitting a bundled/integrated solution shall itemize their cost proposal by service type and provider (i.e. Internet1, Internet2, WAN services, Etc.) The State will evaluate and compare this cost and provider information to help determine whether a single or multi provider solution is in the best interests of the State for this RFP.**

**ATTACHED ARE VENDOR QUESTIONS WITH STATE RESPONSES. NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ANSWERED.**

**Gail Walsh  
State of Rhode Island  
Division of Purchases**

**BID# 7548375**

## **ENTERPRISE INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDER & CORE WAN SERVICES**

1. We assume the State is aware of the requirement that all RFPs must be issued in a fair and open competitive environment. However, the State's RFP solicits a bundle of services, part of which (Internet2 services) can only be provided by one organization thereby preventing all other vendors from submitting a fair competitive proposal. In order to create a proper solicitation, will the State break-up this RFP into an IP component and a WAN/Transport component to gain more (and perhaps more cost effective) responses to the RFP and the services requested?

- This is answered in Addendum #1.

2. What is meant by the statement "all existing peering will be maintained"? BGP peering sessions would need to be changed in the event that a new internet access provider was to be awarded service?

- This reference means that the services and entities that are currently being connected to over our existing ISP for no additional cost will have to continue to operate in the same seamless, cost inclusive manner that our customers require. Some examples of such peering (but not limited to) would be connection to the Northern Crossroads Consortium, the Northeast Research and Education Network and all the services and connectivity offered by Internet 2.

3. Can you please provide a complete list of locations and addresses to be serviced by the enterprise WAN?

- The CORE WAN connections, which are what is being referenced in this RFP, currently consists of the following sites:

### Shared 10GB Connections:

- 1 Capitol Hill, Providence, RI - (Primary)
- 50 Service Ave, Warwick, RI - (Primary)
- 6 Harrington Road, Cranston, RI - (Primary)

### Shared 1GB connections:

- 235 Promenade Street, Providence, RI
- 82 Smith Street, Providence, RI
- 4808 Tower Hill Rd, Wakefield, RI
- 101 Friendship Street, Providence, RI
- 360 Lincoln Ave, Warwick, RI
- 311 Danielson Pike, North Scituate, RI
- 206 Elmwood Ave, Providence, RI
- 217 Pond St, Woonsocket, RI
- 249 Roosevelt Ave, Pawtucket, RI
- 52 Valley Road, Middletown, RI
- 325 Melrose Ave, Providence, RI

4. Is dual entrance a requirement at any enterprise WAN locations?
  - Dual entrances are required at the 3 CORE sites listed in the previous question as “Primary”, but preferred at all of the listed CORE sites.
5. Part of the Criteria for selection is to have a Project Migration Plan, which covers 25 points of the technical proposal. Can we obtain all documentation of the network including Diagrams, configurations, equipment lists, etc. so we can understand what we are migrating from?
  - All three Primary CORE nodes take our current vendor’s Ethernet handoff and terminate ultimately into a State owned and controlled Cisco 6509-E Chassis. All other CORE nodes terminate the vendor’s handoff into either a State owned and controlled Cisco 3945, 3925, or 2821 Router currently. A more detailed discovery and configuration review would certainly be scheduled with the winning vendor for the exact details. You should take all the requirements and complexities listed in the RFP that detail what we have, and what we need, and provide a sample Project Migration Plan so we can evaluate your methodologies to deliver that solution.
6. Based on industry norms of AT&T and Verizon of utilizing one or two national NOCs. What is the intent or advantage to The State to have an instate NOC.
  - We have had poor service experiences when dealing with the large national NOC’s from several different vendors. DoIT often works directly with our current provider’s NOC for problem resolution, as well as the planning and implementation of new network configurations across the enterprise. In addition to standard support calls and audio or webex conferencing, it is commonplace to have face to face meetings with our local NOC team to discuss more complex monitoring issues as well as bandwidth provisioning or design problems proactively. A local NOC will also be more likely to have needed spare parts on hand and available to be more quickly installed in the event of an emergency, which in the regular course of business in the State, with daily Law Enforcement, Life Safety, Healthcare and Legal concerns, is a distinct advantage. Getting lost and put on hold in a large automated Voice Response System regularly is NOT in the State’s (or anyone’s) best interest.
7. What is the review period for the bid and award process? The timeframe from award to expected installation is short for any provider other than the incumbent to meet the deadlines.  
Will The State consider extending the turn up date?
  - It was the intention of this RFP to give the winning vendor 90 days from the date of the award to fully implement the accepted solution. We do not see any change in that intent at this point.